REMARKS

Claims 1-28 were pending in the application. Claims 7-10, 18, 21, and 28 have been amended. Claim 29 has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-29 are now pending in the application.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 11-18, and 21-28 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 15-18, 23-29, and 31 of U.S. Patent No. 7,209,358. Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,209,358 in view of claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,032,037. Applicant respectfully requests the examiner to remove the obviousness-type double patenting rejections in view of the enclosed terminal disclaimers.

35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 Restriction

Claims 1, 2, 10, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Doblar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,922,342). Claims 3-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doblar in view of Kanekar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,191).

1. Applicant respectfully submits that Doblar fails to teach or suggest, "a plurality of shelves, each shelf having a carrier for removably receiving a plurality of information processing modules and a switching module" and "wherein the switching modules of the respective shelves are interconnected in a logical stacking configuration to form a logical stacking arrangement" as recited by claim 1.

The Examiner contends that FIG. 11A of Doblar teach the above-highlighted features of claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner contends that "a plurality of shelves" is

taught by elements 800A-800E and 1010A-1010D, "each shelf" is taught by element 800A, "a carrier" by elements 800A and 560, "an interconnect member" by element 560, "information processing modules" again by element 1010A, and "the switching modules" again by elements 800A-800E. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Doblar discloses:

> FIG. 10 illustrates the physical positioning of the various circuit boards described above. As noted above, the arrangement of the various circuit boards may provide a centerplaneless computer system design. Computer system 10 includes five switch boards labeled 800A-E, two power boards labeled 900A and 900B, four client boards labeled 1010A-D and two service processor boards labeled 1040A-B. (Doblar, Column 12, line 63 – Column 13, line 2)(Emphasis added)

Doblar teaches a "centerplaneless computer system design" which includes five switch boards 800A-E, two power boards 900A-B, four client boards 1010A-D, and two service processor boards 1040A-B. In Doblar, the switch boards and the client boards are "positioned in a substantially orthogonal orientation with respect to each other" (Doblar, Column 13, lines 62-63 and FIGS. 10 and 11A). Applicant notes that Doblar fails to teach or suggest, "a plurality of shelves, **each shelf** having a carrier for removably receiving a plurality of information processing modules **and** a switching module" as recited by claim 1. In Doblar, the client boards 1010A-D and switch boards 800A-E are not included within "a plurality of shelves"; specifically, where "each shelf" includes "a carrier for removably receiving a plurality of information processing modules **and** a switching module" as recited by claim 1.

Additionally, while Doblar teaches that the "centerplaneless computer system design" contains various types of circuit boards, including switch boards 800A-E and client boards 1010A-D which are "positioned in a substantially orthogonal orientation with respect to each other", Doblar fails to teach or suggest, "wherein the switching modules of the **respective shelves** are interconnected in a logical stacking configuration to form a logical stacking arrangement" as recited by claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to patentably distinguish over Doblar. Claims 2-27 are dependent upon claim 1 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

Likewise, claim 28 recites features similar to those highlighted above with regard to claim 1 and is therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Doblar for at least the reasons given in the above paragraphs discussing claim 1.

2. Furthermore, in addition to the assertion that claim 28 is believed to patentably distinguish over Doblar for the reasons given in the above paragraphs discussing claim 1, Doblar fails to teach or suggest, "wherein the shelves are logically connected into a plurality of stacks" as recited by claim 28.

As noted above, Doblar does not disclose that the client boards 1010A-D and switch boards 800A-E are included within "a plurality of shelves." In addition, Applicant submits that Doblar fails to disclose, "wherein the shelves are logically connected into a plurality of stacks" as recited by claim 28. Doblar teaches a "centerplaneless computer system design," where client boards 1010A-D and switch boards 800A-E are "positioned in a substantially orthogonal orientation with respect to each other" (Doblar, Column 12, lines 65, Column 13, lines 62-63 and FIGS. 10 and 11A).

3. Applicant further submits that Doblar and Kanekar, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, "a master **shelf** including a carrier for removably receiving a master switching module, wherein the master switching module is connected into **each stack** as a common master switch **for all of the stacks**; and a system management module coupled to the master switching module and to an external management network via a plurality of management connections, wherein the system management module is configured to provide system-level management functionality to the **shelves in the stacks via the master switching module**" as recited by claim 28.

Accordingly, claim 28 is believed to patentably distinguish over Doblar and Kanekar.

4. Applicant respectfully requests examination of added claim 29, which is believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references.

5. Applicant also asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. For instance:

Applicant submits that Doblar and Kanekar, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, "the shelves are logically connected into a plurality of stacks, wherein the switching modules of the respective shelves in each stack are interconnected in a logical stacking configuration, wherein the computer system further comprises a master shelf including a carrier for removably receiving a master switching module, wherein the master switching module is connected into each stack as a common master switch for all of the stacks, wherein the master switching module is connected to the switching module of a first shelf and to the switching module of a last shelf in each of the stacks" as recited by claim 7. Accordingly, claim 7 is believed to patentably distinguish over Doblar and Kanekar.

Applicant submits that Doblar and Kanekar, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, "further comprising a system management module configured to provide system-level management functionality to the shelves in the stacks, wherein **each** shelf is coupled to the system management module via a management connection" as recited by claim 8. Accordingly, claim 8 is believed to patentably distinguish over Doblar and Kanekar.

Applicant submits that Doblar and Kanekar, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, "further comprising a system management module coupled to the master switching module via one or more management connections, wherein the system management module is configured to provide system-level management functionality to

the shelves in the stacks via the master switching module" as recited by claim 9. Accordingly, claim 9 is believed to patentably distinguish over Doblar and Kanekar.

Applicant submits that Doblar and Kanekar, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, "wherein the master switching module is configured to multiplex management information from the system management module in with data content transmitted to the shelves via inter-shelf connections" as recited by claim 10. Accordingly, claim 10 is believed to patentably distinguish over Doblar and Kanekar.

Applicant submits that Doblar and Kanekar, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, "wherein each switching module of each shelf is connected into a different logical stacking arrangement to the other switching module of that shelf" as recited by claim 13, or "wherein each shelf is connected into two logical stacking arrangements, each switching module of the shelf being connected into a different one of the logical stacking arrangements, and wherein the each logical stacking arrangements provides equivalent connectivity between the shelves as the other logical stacking arrangement" as recited by claim 14. Accordingly, each of claims 13 and 14 are believed to patentably distinguish over Doblar and Kanekar.

Applicant further submits that Doblar and Kanekar, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, "wherein each switching module is content aware" as recited by claim 26, or "wherein the controlling element is operable to study a transmitted data element to determine a path to destination based on the content of that data element" as recited by claim 27. Accordingly, each of claims 26 and 27 are believed to patentably distinguish over Doblar and Kanekar.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-70900/MJL.

Respectfully submitted,

Mario J. Lewin
Reg. No. 54,268
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: August 9, 2007